



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE DEFINITION OF THE CITY<sup>1</sup>

---

RENÉ MAUNIER<sup>2</sup>  
Paris

---

The study of cities is not of interest to the statistician alone. The phenomena of the city, because of the various social consequences flowing from them, are of primary importance to the sociologist. It is astonishing then that a scientific definition of it has scarcely been attempted as yet.

Such is the purpose of the present study. But first we must undertake a critical examination of the current definitions. These fall into two groups.

I. Most of them are based upon some *special characteristic*. They term every social establishment<sup>3</sup> presenting a certain definite quality a city. But they differ as to the nature of the characteristic.<sup>4</sup>

Some authors employ *morphological* characteristics. Cities have commonly been defined as *aggregations* having a certain population,<sup>5</sup> i. e., the city group is characterized by its size or by its extent, by the number of its human elements in connection

<sup>1</sup> This study is an extract from a forthcoming book, *L'origine et la fonction économique des villes, étude de morphologie sociale* ("Bibliothèque sociologique internationale"), Paris, Giard et Brière, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> Translated by L. L. Bernard, The University of Chicago.

<sup>3</sup> The word in the original is *établissement*. Perhaps the English word *community* would have been a better equivalent, though somewhat narrower in sense. It seemed necessary however to use this word to translate *société*. As a consequence the literal, if somewhat awkward and vague, equivalent *establishment* was decided upon.—Tr.

<sup>4</sup> We mention as examples the *biological* definitions, based upon organic comparisons. Thus Dr. Bordier (*La vie des sociétés*, 1887, p. 111) calls cities "the points of ossification of the social organism." See a criticism of this definition by Worms, *Organisme et société*, 1896, p. 163.

<sup>5</sup> It is notably the point of view of Meuriot, *Des agglomérations urbaines dans l'Europe contemporaine*, 1898, and of Weber, *The Growth of Cities*, New York, 1899. Mr. Weber defines cities as aggregations having more than 10,000 inhabitants (*op. cit.*, p. 16).

with the amount of its territorial element. Thus administrative statistics are most frequently based upon this assumption. The French censuses since 1846 and *L'institut international de statistique* since 1887, have applied the term city to every aggregation of more than 2,000 inhabitants. Such a definition cannot serve as the basis of a scientific study, and it has long been denounced as arbitrary. The space occupied by the establishment is too external a characteristic and varies too much according to the circumstances. Several historians have defined the city of the Middle Ages by another morphological characteristic, the presence of a fortification.<sup>6</sup> But apart from the fact that this characteristic, which does not obtain in the case of modern cities, lacks universality, it still could not be used to define and to specify the mediaeval city, for many villages and even farms were also fortified.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The German writers of the eleventh century distinguished two kinds of places: unfortified places (villages) and fortified places (cities). Thus they contrast the *urbs*, *castellum* or *civitas* with the *villa* or the *vicus*. See Keutgen, *Untersuchungen über deutschen Stadtverfassung*, p. 46. Mauer (*Geschichte der Städteverfassung*, I, 31 ff.) says the same: "Cities are villages surrounded by walls." See also Babeau, *La ville sous l'ancien régime*, p. 239, who detects in the rampart the essential quality of the city.

<sup>7</sup> In all primitive societies villages are fortified. Africa: Masqueray, *Formation des cités chez les populations sédentaires de l'Algérie*, p. 86; Cyr. van Overberg, *Les Mayombe*, p. 160 (Belgian Congo); Asia: Cabaton, *Les peuplades demicivilisées de l'Indochine* (*Conférences école coloniale*, 1907-1908, p. 94); *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, ed. Yule, II, 131 (China); Hunter, *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, I, 458; XIII, 88 ff.; Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 302 (the special necessity for protection against the head-hunters); America: Tylor, *Primitive Culture* [French translation, I, 54] (Sioux, Iroquois); Dorsey, *Omaha Sociology*, *Third Rept. Bur. Amer. Ethn.*, pp. 313, 314 (description and plan of Fort Ponka); Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine*, pp. 224, 292; Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, II, 214, 215 (existence of open and fortified villages for refuge in war time); Flach, *Origine historique de l'habitation*, pp. 45 ff., and *Origines de l'ancienne France*, II, 301 ff.; Thierry, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire du Tiers-Etat*, IV, 785 (the villages of Ponthieu were almost all fortified); Stouff, "La description de plusieurs forteresses et seigneuries de Charles le Téméraire," *Revue bourg. Ens. Sup.*, XII, 14 (a village still fortified in 1473). Here is apparent a further reason why aggregations of 22 households, of 50 households, etc., are designated in the texts by the title *castrum* (Molinier, "La senechaussée de Rouergue," *Bib. École Chartes*, 1883, pp. 468, 470 ff., numerous examples). See also K. Hegel, *Entstehung des*

Other writers, among them Rümelin, have made use of *demographical* characteristics and have defined the city for example by the lowness of its birth-rate or by its high marriage-rate. But he himself recognizes that these characteristics are by no means exclusive. The demography of the great city resembles that of the farm; that of the small city resembles that of the village.<sup>8</sup> Moreover the demographical qualities of the city are not sufficiently stable to characterize it. They vary with changes in the size of the city, as well as according to the period and the community. Thus in the Middle Ages the city death-rate was lower than that of the country. At the time of Graunt the reverse was true. At the present time there is again a tendency, due to other causes, toward an urban death-rate lower than that of the country. On the other hand, the birth-rate of the city, which is ordinarily lower than the rural birth-rate, sometimes tends to surpass the latter.<sup>9</sup>

The *juridical* definitions<sup>10</sup> are subject to the same defect that certain morphological definitions have. They are valid for certain types of cities only. Furthermore the juridical characteristics of the city are not universal even in a given social situation. The right of municipality (*droit municipal*) or the right of trade

*deutschen Stadtwesens*, pp. 30, 33. That most of the ancient German villages were fortified has already been remarked by Roscher (*Économie politique rurale* [*Nationalökonomik des Ackerbaues und der verwandten Urproduktionen*], pp. 299, 300), who with Justi considers the village "a product of the age of the right of the strongest;" Gomme, *The Village Community*, pp. 122, 123; Stubbs (*Constitutional History of England*, I, chap. v [French translation, I, 101, note 5, and 114]), even claims that the term *township* which applies to the village as to the city, comes from the woven hedge or *tun* which surrounded all the villages that did not possess a wall proper. See, on the matter of fortified villages of the neolithic age, J. de Morgan, *Les premières civilisations, étude sur la préhistoire et l'histoire*, 1909, p. 152.

<sup>8</sup> Rümelin, "Ville et campagne," in *Problèmes d'économie politique et de statistique*, pp. 210-12.

<sup>9</sup> Thus in Massachusetts and in Sweden. See, Henderson, "Are Modern Industry and City Life Unfavorable to the Family?" *American Journal of Sociology*, XIV, 671.

<sup>10</sup> Justi has defined the city by the existence of a council (*Stadtrat*). But many villages of the Middle Ages had an organ of that sort, as the *panchayat* of the Hindu village of the present. The city has also been defined by the specialness of its law, by the ensemble of its privileges (see, Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 173), what the Germans have called its "Privilegierung."

(*droit du marché*), which have frequently served as criteria for historians, were even in the Middle Ages lacking to many aggregations termed "cities" in the texts,<sup>11</sup> and which were sufficiently important to be classed as such.

The most serious of the unilateral definitions are those based upon some functional characteristic. Every aggregation which is the seat of special activities, regardless of what those activities might be, has sometimes been called a city.<sup>12</sup> The abstract *specialness* of the activity is taken into consideration independently of its concrete content. Still other and more careful writers have demanded the presence of *definite* determined and concrete activities, and notably of certain *industrial* activities.<sup>13</sup> In an offhand way the historians of the present define the mediaeval city by the existence of a market. But the history of the localization of industries proves satisfactorily that no industrial activity is a universal and exclusive characteristic of the city. The ancient cities, as Sombart, following Bücher,<sup>14</sup> points out, were generally consumption cities, even the greatest of them. And in modern

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Planiol, "Les villes de Bretagne au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Nouv. rev. historique de droit*, 1894, p. 134.

<sup>12</sup> Müller-Lyer, *Phasen der Kultur und Richtungslinien des Fortschritts*, 1908, p. 133.

<sup>13</sup> Adam Smith said (*Wealth of Nations*, Book III, chap. iii [French transl., pp. 475, 485]): "Cities are inhabited chiefly by artisans and tradespeople." A large portion of this article will go to prove the falsity of this statement, so far as it concerns the Middle Ages. See, especially Sombart, "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," *Braun's Archiv*, 1907, XXV, 2: Cities are "aggregations of men dependent upon the products of outside agricultural labor for their subsistence." But this proposition, as that of Smith, is true only for relatively modern cities. Ratzel, *Anthropogeographie*, II, 406, also defines the city as an industrial and commercial center. Sieveking, "Die mittelalterliche Stadt, in *Vierteljahrschrift für Soc. und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1904, II, 190, defines it as a center of *exchange*.

<sup>14</sup> See, *Études d'histoire et d'économie politique*, pp. 342, 343. Cantillon held a more correct view when he wrote (*Essai sur le commerce*, p. 20), "The assemblage of several wealthy proprietors of land, who live together in the same place, suffices to form a city." Sombart would reply that these purely consumers live wholly from the agricultural labor on the outside. But it will be shown in detail farther on that among many peoples agriculture holds a considerable place even in the cities and in their centers. This is a fact too little known.

times there are cities of complex activities and cities of specialized activities, industrial cities and commercial cities.<sup>15</sup> It might even be said that its activity (*function*) is one of the most variable characteristics of the city.

II. Let us pass next to definitions based upon *multiple characteristics*. Most commonly they distinguish the city by a multiplicity of characteristics which are *of the same nature*. Thus M. Pirenne defines the city by means of a group of morphological characteristics,<sup>16</sup> and various contemporary economists define it by means of a group of functional characteristics.<sup>17</sup> But the characteristics employed by the definition may also be *of an unlike nature*. The definition will then be based both upon the morphological and upon the functional characteristics of the aggregation.<sup>18</sup> But these definitions, being merely amalgamations of numerous simple definitions, already set forth, are subject to the same criticisms.

<sup>15</sup> See, for all this, my article, "La distribution géographique des industries," *Revue internationale de sociologie*, July, 1908.

<sup>16</sup> The city, he says, is distinguished in a level country by its *gates*, the *churches*, and the *density* of the population. See, "L'origine des constitutions urbaines," *Revue historique*, t. LVII, 64.

<sup>17</sup> For example, by the coexistence of industrial, commercial, and political activities.

<sup>18</sup> In 1801 the court at Rennes defined the city as an aggregation having "a *numerous population*, with which are connected *public institutions* for the harmony of general association and the *commercial needs*" (cited by Ramalho, "Des villes, bourgs et villages," in the *Revue générale d'administration*, 1901, t. I, 291). Geddes, "Civics as Concrete and Applied Sociology," in *Sociological Papers* of the Sociological Society of London, 1905, II, 67 ff., 88 ff., defines the city as composed of three elements: *people* (individuals and institutions), *affairs* (activities), and *places*. Von Below (see Burger, in *Conrad'schen Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, II, 1181) characterizes the mediaeval city both by the *fortification* and by the *market*. Likewise Heil, *Die deutschen Städte im Mittelalter*, pp. 25-27. Flach, *Origines de l'ancienne France*, II, 329, defines the city at the same time by the *material defense*, the *religious protection*, and the *commercial activity*. But the possession of a market with the special right attached thereto was far from characterizing all the cities. See a criticism of these definitions by Hassert, *Die Städte geographisch betrachtet*, 1907, pp. 4-6.

All these definitions,<sup>19</sup> whether simple or complex, have certain vices in common. They rest upon characteristics which are too special, many of which are also superficial and secondary, and many more are not universal but apply to certain types of cities only. The definition should partake of a sociological character, which ought to present the following qualities:

1. It ought to be *universal (constant)*, i. e., be common to all the types of cities. This condition goes without discussion.

2. It ought to be *uniform (fixe)*, i. e., it ought to be found everywhere relatively unchanged, and vary as little as possible in degree. For a modality which, while existing in the various forms of its object, varies among these forms, would not answer to the purpose of the definition, which is to allow easy recognition of the object defined, and to enable it to be distinguished at a glance.

It is seen at once that the characteristic in question ought not to be a *functional* characteristic; no characteristic of this kind can be universal and uniform. *Specialization* in activity, considered abstractly and in itself, is true of only certain types of cities. It is wanting in what has been called "urban industry" (*économie urbaine*). And likewise the concrete nature of the activity varies greatly according to the cities specialized (commercial cities, industrial cities, or even those at different times dependent upon different industries, etc.).

The criteria which we employ ought then to be of the *morphological* order; and since we have already eliminated certain criteria of that type, the field of our choice will be rather limited. Neither the territory covered by the establishment, nor the condition of things which it implies (rampart, construction of the houses) can suffice for our needs. The external form of the aggregation is not any more specific. There is left to us then only the characteristics relative to its *internal structure*. The

<sup>19</sup> We must also mention the study of the *psychological* characters of the city, made by Simmel, in "Die Grosstädte und das Geistesleben," *Jahrbuch der Gehe-Stiftung*, IX, Dresden, 1903; by Marpillero, "Laggio di psicologia dell'urbanismo," *Rivista italiana di sociologia*, XII, September-October, 1908; and so ingeniously by Professor Ross in his *Social Psychology*, New York, 1908, pp. 58 ff., 181 ff.

problem is to understand the nature of the structure which differentiates the city from other types of establishment; and to solve this problem it is necessary to arrive at a general classification of these types.

Cantillon, who, in his *Essai sur la nature du commerce*, was among the first to attempt a classification<sup>20</sup> has distinguished four types of habitation: the village,<sup>21</sup> the town, the city, the capital. The classification in use today is more simple. It distinguishes the isolated farm, the village, the city. The one here proposed is more simple still. It distinguishes only two main types of establishment, each comprehending a certain number of sub-types.

The first category has to do with *simple establishments*, i. e., with a single social group. It includes what may be termed briefly the farm, composed of a single family; the hamlet and the village, composed of a number of families which form among themselves a unit community, a single political and social organism. The purest type of the village is the *long house*, such as that found among the American Indians or in Oceania, where all the members of the village live in common in a single house,<sup>22</sup> each family possessing for private use only a single compartment. At its

<sup>20</sup> It is necessary to mention, as earlier still, Botero (*Delle cause delle grandezza e magnificenza città*, Rome, 1588) who dwelt on the conditions and physical limitations of the development of cities. The importance of the same for statistics and sociology has been perceived by Kovalewsky. See his memoir on Botero in Vol. III of the *Annales de l'institut international de sociologie*.

<sup>21</sup> He does not speak of the isolated farm, which was doubtless still rare in his time, but which was to be found everywhere in England since the eleventh century. See Vinogradoff, *English Society in the Eleventh Century*, Oxford, 1908, pp. 264, 267, 268; Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, pp. 15, 16. A little later, Steuart, in his *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy* (*Works*, London, 1805), I, 59 ff., in chap. ix, entitled, "What Are the Principles Which Regulate the Distribution of Inhabitants into Farms, Villages, Hamlets, Towns, and Cities?" completed from this point of view the classification of Cantillon and distinguished the farm, the hamlet, the village, and the city.

<sup>22</sup> See Morgan, *Ancient Society*, New York, 1878, p. 399, who cites houses containing 160 persons. De Morgan, in *Les premières civilisations, études sur la préhistoire et l'histoire*, 1909, p. 121, points out that in the eighteenth century the populations of Kamchatka lived in a sort of subterranean house of from 20 to 100 meters in length and from 6 to 10 meters in width, divided into compartments, and where as many as 300 people crowded together.



origin, the village is only the development of a clan. It comprises a true undivided family, a community closely cemented through collective responsibility. And although the modern village is composed of a number of families living separately, these families are units too restricted and otherwise too loosely held together to constitute true social divisions. They do not affect the village's organization, which remains homogeneous and simple.

The second category of social establishments has to do with *complex establishments*, i. e., with numerous forms of distinct social groups; those which we will term *cities*. They have various degrees of complexity, and the combination of their parts is effected in different ways. But two characteristics, which constitute the definition of the city, are common to all: a primary and a secondary characteristic.

I. Ordinarily the city is defined as an aggregation, or to be more specific, as a contraction of the community or of a part of the community. This, however, is not for our purposes the most important characteristic. It is rather the fact that the city is a *complex community*, i. e., *formed from a number of secondary groups*.<sup>23</sup> The city is a community composed of an aggregation of smaller communities, such as families, professional groups, etc. Thus it is conceived, not as a simple geographic fact, nor even as a simple industrial phenomenon, but as a social fact. The city is not to be regarded as an isolated phenomenon, *sui generis*. It is a *community (société)*, which must be identified, because of its characteristics, with a certain social type, and which differs from other communities of the same class only in degree.

II. In effect, within this class of complex communities, there exist communities of two types. Those of one kind have a definite localization, within varying limits of course, but always closely connected with a certain portion of territory. The others are personal associations without geographical localization. The local clan, the village, the province, the nation, are communities

<sup>23</sup> La Bruyère has said, "The city is partitioned into diverse communities which are so many small republics which have their laws, their customs, their jargon. . . ."—*Caractères*, chap. vii, p. 4.

of the former type. The totemic clan, the commercial company, the universal church, are of the second. To be sure even the latter are not without attachment to a certain point of space, the totemic center, the community seat, or holy city. But they always overflow its bounds, and it serves them as a center only.

The city is a community of the former class. But within that class itself it occupies a special place. And in this respect it is the second characteristic which makes it possible to distinguish it from other communities of the same type. All have a localization sufficiently clearly defined. But that localization varies in extent, the community varies in dispersion and consequently the density of the social elements, men and things, varies. An Indian or Eskimo tribe occupies an enormous territory, *relative to the number of its members*. The city, on the contrary, is a community which, *in relation to its size*—or, if preferred, in relation to the number of its human elements—occupies an especially limited area.<sup>24</sup> But this is a distinction merely of degree, exclusive only in that it sets off the city, an element within a social type, from other communities of the same kind. However, it is not the second characteristic which distinguishes it from other general types of establishment, and that is why we characterize it as secondary. It can not be truly said what is the minimum limit of space that will allow the community which occupies it to be called a city. This is not an *absolute* but a *relative* matter, which varies according to the population of the city. There is between the city and the more dispersed community of the same type a whole series of intermediary establishments. Such a city as Paris occupies a larger area than a small community which, however, is not a city. But because of its enormous population it constitutes a compact conglomerate of social groups, and that is sufficient.

<sup>24</sup> Consequently, a *market* (*marché*), from its function of uniting a number of social groups, as the intertribal markets (*fairs*), may be regarded as a temporary city. There are also seasonal "cities" and on the other hand the market often presents morphological characteristics analogous to those of the "city." It is frequently fortified even. But we must not, because of that, say with M. Pirenne that all cities spring from markets. The market is only a type of the city, characterized by *periodicity* and a certain *function*.

The city is then *a complex community of which the geographic localization is especially limited in relation to the city's size (volume), of which the amount of territory is relatively small with reference to the number of human beings.*

This definition takes cognizance of the external characteristic upon which the current definitions are based: the more copious population of the city. For a complex community is normally larger and more numerous than a simple community, since it is made up of a number of simple communities. But it is not necessarily more extensive, for there are simple communities of extremely varied dimensions. Thus it is seen that this external characteristic is not sufficiently invariable to be used as a definition.

Accordingly our definition leads to certain results. Tending to reverse the traditional hierarchy of the characteristics of the city in regarding as secondary the fact of aggregation, and as primary that of complexity, and thus replacing in the definition a purely external characteristic with a vital one, it shows the difference between the city and the village to be both less and greater than it is ordinarily represented as being. It is less in the first place, because we do not describe the city in terms of some *activity (function)*, industrial or other, which is supposed to be proper to it alone. Since the city differs from the village only in its more complex *morphology*, an aggregation of adjacent villages is sufficient, as will be shown, to constitute a city. But from another point of view the difference between the two appears to be more marked. They are not merely two kinds of establishments differing solely in their dimensions, but they are two communities of different types. The essential difference between the communities is here also one of morphology. But it is a more profound morphological characteristic which marks the distinction. Dissimilarity of internal structure takes the place of a simple unlikeness in extent.

Another and final result is the determination of the modalities of this latter characteristic according to which the *types* of the urban phenomena are to be classified. Instead of classifying the

cities after the manner of the statisticians, as small, medium, and large, we shall attempt to arrange the urban types according to their degree of complexity and especially according to the nature of the composition of their parts. It is possible thus to distinguish two very different types of cities. This distinction marks out our study, for only one of these, the more elementary, will constitute its main object.

The city, we have said, is a complex local group. But the simpler groups of which it is composed are themselves either *local groups*, or on the contrary *personal associations* without distinctive and definite geographic localization. In the former case the city is made up of locally juxtaposed groups, each of which has its distinct location in the city territory.<sup>25</sup> In the latter case the secondary groups which constitute the city are confounded geographically and occupy the urban territory without dividing it. The districts (*quartiers*), the trades (*métiers*) of the Middle Ages occupying each its own street, are divisions of the former class. Families or the professions of the present, whose members are scattered throughout the city, are examples of the second. In the former case the urban territory is itself complex and heterogeneous, made up of numerous and distinct social regions. In the second it is simple and undivided. In this latter case the complexity of the urban community does not affect the organization of its territory; each of the secondary groups

<sup>25</sup> Thus the cities of the Pueblo Indians are each formed from one *tribe*, itself constituted of several *clans*, each of which occupies its distinct quarter in the city, separated from that of the rest. See, on their organization, Krause, "Die Pueblo-Indianer," in *Abhandlungen der Kaiserl. Leop.-carol. deutschen Akademie des Naturforschers*, Band 87, Halle, 1907, p. 50; Gatschet, *A Migration Legend of the Creek Indians*, 1884, pp. 154, 172, 173 (Creeks and Dakotas). Each clan has its group of houses designated by a distinctive emblem; Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 47 (Ottawas); Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," in *Third Rept. Bur. Amer. Ethn.*, 1883, pp. 219 ff.; Powell, "Wyandot Government," in *First Rept. Bur. Amer. Ethn.*, p. 64. See especially the exceptional work of Mindeleff, "Localization of Tusayan Clans," in *Nineteenth Rept. Bur. Amer. Ethn.*, pp. 639-699 (Tusayan and Hopis); by the same author, "A Study of Pueblo Architecture," in *Eighth Rept. Bur. Amer. Ethn.* See Morgan, "Houses and House Life of the American Aborigines," in *First Rept. of the Archeological Institute of America*, 1881, and E. Sarfert, "Haus und Dorf bei den eingeboren Nordamerikas," in *Archiv. für Anthropologie*, VII, 1908.

being distributed over the whole of the city. A city of the former kind might be called a *segmental* or *partitioned city*, and that of the latter an *undivided* or *homogeneous city*, these terms applying to the urban territory, not to the urban community which is always complex, divided, heterogeneous.

Thus the city is in itself a matter of *differentiation*. Just as it is a complex community, so has it necessarily a heterogeneous and differentiated structure. Although its *organization* is naturally and essentially a phenomenon of social differentiation, the same is not necessarily true of its *functioning* (*fonctionnement*). The latter presents two aspects.

I. Considered in its ensemble and as a whole, the city has an industrial function, i. e., it is the seat of a group of activities for transforming economic goods. This function may or may not be differentiated. The city may be the seat of a complex of activities or "industries," including the industry of agriculture. It may on the contrary develop within itself more or less exclusively certain industrial functions. The loss of the agricultural function to the city, which becomes the special seat of "industry," is an early differentiation of this sort. For there arises, as Adam Smith and, later, Stuart Mill have pointed out, a *division of labor between the city and the country*. At a more advanced stage the city specializes in certain kinds of industrial activities, and thence arises a *division of labor between the cities*, of which Sombart has classified the types and measured the influence upon the internal arrangement of the industries in the city itself.

II. From this we are led to consider the functioning of the city under its second or internal aspect. If we recall the well-known propositions and classifications, all of which treat the city from the *external* point of view, it will be seen that our inquiry tends to give more importance to the other, the *internal*, point of view, to define the city as an industrial phenomenon and to classify its types less by its *external functional characteristics* than by its *internal functional characteristics*. Thus we take up a position quite different from that which the economists are accustomed to occupy, as appears from what follows.

The city, according to the definition which we have given, is

a complex whole, made up of parts; it is a social group formed from secondary groups. Its total function, however, is not distributed among these parts. And the parts or secondary groups themselves may or may not have a definite localization in the territory occupied by the group as a whole. When they are localized and not specialized we have the kind of city which we have termed *undifferentiated* (*indifférenciée*). When they are localized and specialized, there is what we may call a *differentiated* (*différenciée*) city, thus conferring upon that word a special and definite sense which refers exclusively to the *internal* functioning of the urban organism.

Thus, in its *morphology* as in its *functioning*, the city in its simple and primitive form appears to be a community comparable to the rural *milieu* which surrounds it. It differs only because of a certain closing in or contraction which results in a greater density of men and things in the urban region. The city then by no means implies, as has often been said, a high development of commercial functions and relations. For it to come into existence it is necessary, but also sufficient, that, for any cause whatever, a complex community, i. e., a community composed of secondary groups, should be compelled to contract, to reduce the territory which it occupies and to confine itself to a narrower region. For this reason it is possible for cities to originate in communities as yet little developed, where war is almost constant and where as a consequence the social groups could not exist in a scattered condition. It is under such conditions that most of the cities among the aborigines of Africa and of America have arisen. Thus war has played the same rôle in the formation of urban civilizations that commerce comes to play in its turn. Operations of exchange have succeeded in this respect merely in developing and transforming the beginnings which had been made before. This shows why the commercial centers have always grown up around previously formed military centers. The original causes of the city then are not industrial. But only with the growth of industrial relations can the most advanced types of the city appear.